



The Human Rights Advisory Panel

Building D, UNMIK HQ Prishtinë/Priština, Kosovo | E-mail: hrap-unmik@un.org | Tel: +381 (0)38 504-604, ext. 5182

OPINION

Date of adoption: 25 April 2013

Cases Nos. 67/09 & 140/09

Rada ĐUKANOVIĆ and Radmila ĐUKANOVIĆ

against

UNMIK

The Human Rights Advisory Panel, on 25 April 2013,
with the following members taking part:

Mr Marek NOWICKI, Presiding Member
Ms Christine CHINKIN
Ms Françoise TULKENS

Assisted by

Mr Andrey ANTONOV, Executive Officer

Having considered the aforementioned complaint, introduced pursuant to Section 1.2 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 of 23 March 2006 on the establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel,

Having deliberated, including through electronic means, in accordance with Rule 13 § 2 of its Rules of Procedure, makes the following findings and recommendations:

I. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE PANEL

1. The complaint of Mrs Rada Đukanović (case no. 67/09) was introduced on 9 April 2009 and registered on 30 April 2009 and the complaint of Mrs Radmila Đukanović (case no. 140/09) was introduced on 2 February 2009 and registered on 30 April 2009.

2. On 24 July 2009, the Panel communicated case no. 67/09 to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG)¹ for UNMIK's comments on the admissibility and the merits of the case. On 30 November 2009, the SRSG provided UNMIK's response which indicated that it was in the process of obtaining more information from KFOR in relation to the matter.
3. On 9 December 2009, the Panel requested further information from the complainants in case no. 140/09.
4. On 21 December 2009, the Panel requested the SRSG to notify it when UNMIK requested information from KFOR and to be kept abreast of developments related to that request. On 12 January 2010, UNMIK provided its response, indicating that a letter had been sent to KFOR on 17 December 2009.
5. On 19 April 2010, the Panel decided to join cases nos. 67/09 and 140/09 pursuant to Rule 20 of the Panel's Rules of Procedure.
6. On 2 November 2010, the Panel re-communicated case no. 67/09 and communicated case no. 140/09 to the SRSG for UNMIK's comments on the admissibility of the cases in light of the decision to join them. On 13 December 2010, UNMIK provided its response.
7. On 18 March 2011, the Panel declared the complaints admissible.
8. On 25 March 2011, the Panel forwarded the decision on admissibility to the SRSG, inviting UNMIK's observations on the merits of the case, as well as asking for the investigative files in the matter. On 18 April 2011, the SRSG provided UNMIK's response.
9. On 15 March 2013, the Panel requested UNMIK to confirm if the disclosure of files concerning the case could be considered final. On 20 March 2013, UNMIK submitted its response.

II. THE FACTS

A. General background²

10. The events at issue took place in the territory of Kosovo after the establishment of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), in June 1999.

¹ A list of abbreviations and acronyms contained in the text can be found in the attached Annex.

² The references drawn upon by the Panel in setting out this general background include: OSCE, "As Seen, as Told", Vol. 1 (October 1998 – June 1999) and Vol. II (14 June – 31 October 1999); quarterly reports of the UN Secretary-General on the United Nations Interim Administration in Kosovo; UNMIK Police Annual Reports (2000, 2001); Humanitarian Law Centre, "Abductions and Disappearances of non-Albanians in Kosovo" (2001); Humanitarian Law Centre, "Kosovo Memory Book" (<http://www.kosovomemorybook.org>); UNMIK Office on Missing Persons and Forensics, Activity Report 2002-2004; European Court of Human Rights, *Behrami and Behrami v. France* and *Saramati v. France, Germany and Norway*, nos. 71412/01 and 78166/01, decision of 2 May 2007; International Commission on Missing Persons, "The Situation in Kosovo: a Stock Taking" (2010); data issued by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, (available at www.unhcr.org) and by the International Committee of the Red Cross (available at <http://familylinks.icrc.org/kosovo/en>).

11. The armed conflict during 1998 and 1999 between the Serbian forces on one side and the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and other Kosovo Albanian armed groups on the other is well documented. Following the failure of international efforts to resolve the conflict, on 23 March 1999, the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) announced the commencement of air strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). The air strikes began on 24 March 1999 and ended on 8 June 1999 when the FRY agreed to withdraw its forces from Kosovo. On 9 June 1999, the International Security Force (KFOR), the FRY and the Republic of Serbia signed a “Military Technical Agreement” by which they agreed on FRY withdrawal from Kosovo and the presence of an international security force following an appropriate UN Security Council Resolution.
12. On 10 June 1999, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1244 (1999). Acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council decided upon the deployment of international security and civil presences - KFOR and UNMIK respectively - in the territory of Kosovo. Pursuant to Security Council Resolution No. 1244 (1999), the UN was vested with full legislative and executive powers for the interim administration of Kosovo, including the administration of justice. KFOR was tasked with establishing “a secure environment in which refugees and displaced persons can return home in safety” and temporarily ensuring “public safety and order” until the international civil presence could take over responsibility for this task. UNMIK comprised four main components or pillars led by the United Nations (civil administration), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (humanitarian assistance, which was phased out in June 2000), the OSCE (institution building) and the EU (reconstruction and economic development). Each pillar was placed under the authority of the SRSG. UN Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) mandated UNMIK to “promote and protect human rights” in Kosovo in accordance with internationally recognised human rights standards.
13. Estimates regarding the effect of the conflict on the displacement of the Kosovo Albanian population range from approximately 800,000 to 1.45 million. Following the adoption of Resolution 1244 (1999), the majority of Kosovo Albanians who had fled, or had been forcibly expelled from their houses by the Serbian forces during the conflict, returned to Kosovo.
14. Meanwhile, members of the non-Albanian community – mainly but not exclusively Serbs, Roma and Slavic Muslims – as well as Kosovo Albanians suspected of collaboration with the Serbian authorities, became the target of widespread attacks by Kosovo Albanian armed groups. Current estimates relating to the number of Kosovo Serbs displaced fall within the region of 200,000 to 210,000. Whereas most Kosovo Serbs and other non-Albanians fled to Serbia proper and the neighbouring countries, those remaining behind became victims of systematic killings, abductions, arbitrary detentions, sexual and gender based violence, beatings and harassment.
15. Although figures remain disputed, it is estimated that more than 15,000 deaths or disappearances occurred during and in the immediate aftermath of the Kosovo conflict (1998-2000). More than 3,000 ethnic Albanians, and about 800 Serbs, Roma and members of other minority communities went missing during this period. More than half of the missing persons had been located and their mortal remains identified by the end of 2010,

while 1,766 are listed as still missing by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) as of October 2012.

16. As of July 1999, as part of the efforts to restore law enforcement in Kosovo within the framework of the rule of law, the SRSG urged UN member States to support the deployment within the civilian component of UNMIK of 4,718 international police personnel. UNMIK Police were tasked with advising KFOR on policing matters until they themselves had sufficient numbers to take full responsibility for law enforcement and to work towards the development of a Kosovo police service. By September 1999, approximately 1,100 international police officers had been deployed to UNMIK.
17. By December 2000, the deployment of UNMIK Police was almost complete with 4,400 personnel from 53 different countries, and UNMIK had assumed primacy in law enforcement responsibility in all regions of Kosovo except for Mitrovicë/Mitrovica. According to the 2000 Annual Report of UNMIK Police, 351 kidnappings, 675 murders and 115 rapes had been reported to them in the period between June 1999 and December 2000.
18. Due to the collapse of the administration of justice in Kosovo, UNMIK established in June 1999 an Emergency Justice System. This was composed of a limited number of local judges and prosecutors and was operational until a regular justice system became operative in January 2000. In February 2000, UNMIK authorised the appointment of international judges and prosecutors, initially in the Mitrovicë/Mitrovica region and later across Kosovo, to strengthen the local justice system and to guarantee its impartiality. As of October 2002, the local justice system comprised 341 local and 24 international judges and prosecutors. In January 2003, the UN Secretary-General reporting to the Security Council on the implementation of Resolution 1244 (1999) defined the police and justice system in Kosovo at that moment as being “well-functioning” and “sustainable”.
19. In July 1999, the UN Secretary-General reported to the Security Council that UNMIK already considered the issue of missing persons as a particularly acute human rights concern in Kosovo. In November 1999, a Missing Persons Unit (MPU) was established within UNMIK Police, mandated to investigate with respect to either the possible location of missing persons and/or gravesites. The MPU, jointly with the Central Criminal Investigation Unit (CCIU) of UNMIK Police, and later a dedicated War Crimes Investigation Unit (WCIU), were responsible for the criminal aspects of missing persons cases in Kosovo. In May 2000, a Victim Recovery and Identification Commission (VRIC) chaired by UNMIK was created for the recovery, identification and disposition of mortal remains. As of June 2002, the newly established Office on Missing Persons and Forensics (OMPF) in the UNMIK Department of Justice (DOJ) became the sole authority mandated to determine the whereabouts of missing persons, identify their mortal remains and return them to the family of the missing. Starting from 2001, based on a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between UNMIK and the Sarajevo-based International Commission of Missing Persons (ICMP), supplemented by a further agreement in 2003, the identification of mortal remains was carried out by the ICMP through DNA testing.
20. On 9 December 2008, UNMIK’s responsibility with regard to police and justice in Kosovo ended with the European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX) assuming full

operational control in the area of the rule of law, following the Statement made by the President of the United Nations Security Council on 26 November 2008 (S/PRST/2008/44), welcoming the continued engagement of the European Union in Kosovo.

21. On the same date, UNMIK and EULEX signed a MoU on the modalities, and the respective rights and obligations arising from the transfer from UNMIK to EULEX of cases and the related files which involved on-going investigations, prosecutions and other activities undertaken by UNMIK International Prosecutors. Shortly thereafter, similar agreements were signed with regard to the files handled by international judges and UNMIK Police. All agreements obliged EULEX to provide to UNMIK access to the documents related to the actions previously undertaken by UNMIK authorities. Between 9 December 2008 and 30 March 2009, all criminal case files held by the UNMIK DOJ and UNMIK Police were handed over to EULEX.

B. Circumstances surrounding the abduction and death of Mr Dragomir Đukanović and Mr Jovica Đukanović.

22. The first complainant (case no. 67/09) is the wife of Dragomir Đukanović and the mother of Jovica Đukanović. The second complainant (case no. 140/09) is the wife of Jovica Đukanović.
23. According to the complainants, the first complainant and Dragomir Đukanović remained in Prizren following the entry of KFOR and UNMIK into Kosovo in June 1999. However, the first complainant's son, Jovica Đukanović, and the second complainant left for Shtërpçë/Štrpce on 14 June 1999, along with their family.
24. Believing that the situation was calm, Jovica Đukanović and the second complainant returned to Prizren on 10 July 1999 to visit the first complainant and Dragomir Đukanović at their home and to stay the night. Early the following morning, 11 July 1999, the second complainant went to her former place of employment to obtain her work records. Then at approximately 09:15, three young men appeared at the door of the apartment. One of the men was armed. They entered the apartment and conducted a search for weapons, but apparently did not find any. Having finished the search, they requested that Jovica Đukanović accompany them for "an informative talk."
25. The first complainant pleaded with them not to take her son, as did Dragomir Đukanović. The three men suggested that Dragomir Đukanović should also go with them, promising that they would not harm him and that they would bring him back in 30 minutes.
26. Immediately after they left, the first complainant went to the German KFOR unit stationed approximately 70 meters from her apartment to report what had happened. KFOR replied that she should return to her home as her husband and son would return later in the day.
27. When they had not returned by the following day, the first complainant returned to the KFOR unit and gave them the registration number of the car the three men were driving, a description of the clothes her husband and son were wearing when they were taken, and a description of the three men who took them.

28. The first complainant also approached the ICRC and a number of humanitarian organisations with offices in Prizren seeking help. She also went to the local headquarters of the KLA to request help in locating her husband and son. She was allegedly threatened and insulted there and informed that she would meet the same fate if she did not return home. The first complainant also reported the disappearances to UNMIK prior to her departure from Prizren on 27 December 1999.
29. From the death certificates issued by the UNMIK Office on Missing Persons and Forensics (OMPF), it appears the mortal remains, later identified as Dragomir and Jovica Đukanović, were discovered in October 1999, although the exact location is uncertain. The name of Jovica Đukanović appears in a list of missing persons communicated by the ICRC to UNMIK on 12 October 2001. The first complainant states that the remains were discovered by “British officers of UNMIK” at the entrance of Novak/Novake village following a tip-off from someone who had recognised Dragomir Đukanović.
30. On 12 December 2003, UNMIK OMPF conducted an autopsy on mortal remains which were subsequently identified as those of Jovica Đukanović.
31. On 27 July 2005, UNMIK OMPF issued a death certificate for Jovica Đukanović. The cause of death was indicated as undetermined due to the condition of the mortal remains.
32. The mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović were also eventually identified and along with those of Jovica Đukanović were handed over to the family at Merdare on 2 August 2005.

C. The Investigation

33. In the present case, the Panel received from UNMIK investigative documents previously held by the UNMIK OMPF and MPU. The file as presented relates only to the identification and return of the mortal remains of Jovica Đukanović. No additional investigative material regarding the criminal investigation following the return of the mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović were provided.
34. Concerning disclosure of information contained in the files, the Panel recalls that UNMIK has made available investigative files for the Panel’s review under a pledge of confidentiality. In this regard, the Panel must clarify that although its assessment of the present case stems from a thorough examination of the available documentation, only limited information contained therein is disclosed. Hence a synopsis of relevant investigative steps taken by investigative authorities is provided in the paragraphs to follow.
35. No indication is given in the MPU file regarding when the abduction was reported to UNMIK. The file does indicate that in 2001, an ante-mortem victim identification form was completed for Jovica Đukanović by the MPU.
36. The file indicates that on 12 December 2003 unidentified mortal remains taken from an undisclosed gravesite were autopsied. These had been discovered along with a 7.65 mm bullet. They were later identified as those of Jovica Đukanović. The cause of death, however, was undetermined.

37. The file indicates that on 24 May 2004, MPU investigators interviewed the daughter of Dragomir Đukanović. In the summary of the interview provided to the Panel, she describes the events leading up to the abduction. In addition, she gives the licence plate number of the vehicle from which her father and brother were taken, as well as the names of five possible suspects involved in the abduction. The concluding entry made by the MPU officer on this summary of the interview is that the case should be handed over to the CCIU for further enquiry.
38. The OMPF file contains a copy of a fax dated 3 July 2004 from the Serbian Ministry of Internal Affairs to UNMIK Police identifying possible suspects involved in the abduction.
39. On 29 July 2005, based on the results of the DNA analysis and on the comparison of ante-mortem and post-mortem information, the UNMIK OMPF issued a confirmation of identity certificate for Jovica Đukanović.
40. On the same day, a death certificate for him was issued by the Office of the Medical Examiner.
41. On 2 August 2005, the second complainant Mrs Radmila Đukanović received the mortal remains of Jovica Đukanović.
42. In relation to Dragomir Đukanović, no detailed activity is recorded in the file. However, a memorandum dated 31 July 2004 from the MPU that is included in the file indicates that in December 2002, autopsies were conducted on mortal remains located in one of the gravesites at a cemetery in Prizren. Clothing found with one of the mortal remains was identified, by a close relative of the complainants, as belonging to Dragomir Đukanović. However, the memorandum goes on to state that in relation to Dragomir Đukanović, no positive DNA match has yet been made.
43. The final paragraph in this memorandum states that “the information regarding the suspects involved in the abduction and probable murder of these persons has been given to the CCIU. It is understood that the investigation is still ongoing”.

III. THE COMPLAINT

44. The complainants complain about UNMIK’s alleged failure to properly investigate into the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović. In this regard, the Panel deems that they invoke a violation of the procedural limb of Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).
45. The complainants also complain about the mental pain and suffering allegedly caused to themselves and their family by this situation. In this regard, the Panel considers that the complainants rely on Article 3 of the ECHR.

IV. THE LAW

A. The scope of the Panel's review

46. In determining whether it considers that there has been a violation of Article 2 (procedural limb) and of Article 3 of the ECHR, the Panel is mindful of the existing case-law, notably that of the European Court of Human Rights. However, the Panel is also aware that the complaints before it differ in some significant ways from those brought before that Court. First, the respondent is not a State but an interim international territorial administration mandated to exercise temporary responsibilities in Kosovo. No suspicion attaches to UNMIK with respect to the substantive obligations under ECHR Article 2. Second, as in a limited number of cases before the European Court, those suspected of being responsible for the alleged killings and/or abductions are in all cases before the Panel non-state actors, mostly but not exclusively connected to the conflict. These are factors for the Panel to take into consideration as it assesses for the first time the procedural positive obligations of an intergovernmental organisation with respect to acts committed by third parties in a territory over which it has temporary legislative, executive and judicial control.
47. Before turning to the examination of the merits of the complaint, the Panel needs to clarify the scope of its review.
48. The Panel notes that with the adoption of the UNMIK Regulation No. 1999/1 on 25 July 1999 UNMIK undertook an obligation to observe internationally recognised human rights standards in exercising its functions. This undertaking was detailed in UNMIK Regulation No. 1999/24 of 12 December 1999, by which UNMIK assumed obligations under the following human rights instruments: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the European Convention on Human Rights and Protocols thereto, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
49. The Panel also notes that Section 1.2 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 of 23 March 2006 on the Establishment of the Human Rights Advisory Panel provides that the Panel “shall examine complaints from any person or group of individuals claiming to be the victim of a violation by UNMIK of (their) human rights”. It follows that only acts or omissions attributable to UNMIK fall within the jurisdiction *ratione personae* of the Panel. In this respect, it should be noted, as stated above, that as of 9 December 2008, UNMIK no longer exercises executive authority over the Kosovo judiciary and law enforcement machinery. Therefore UNMIK bears no responsibility for any violation of human rights allegedly committed by those bodies. Insofar as the complainants complain about acts that occurred after that date, they fall outside the jurisdiction *ratione personae* of the Panel.
50. Likewise, the Panel emphasises that, as far as its jurisdiction *rationemateriae* is concerned, as follows from Section 1.2 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12, it can only examine complaints relating to an alleged violation of human rights. This means that it can only review acts or omissions complained of for their compatibility with the international human

rights instruments referred to above (see § 48). In the particular case of killings and disappearances in life-threatening circumstances, it is not the Panel's role to replace the competent authorities in the investigation of the case. Its task is limited to examining the effectiveness of the criminal investigation into such killings and disappearances, in the light of the procedural obligations flowing from Article 2 of the ECHR.

51. The Panel further notes that Section 2 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 provides that the Panel shall have jurisdiction over complaints relating to alleged violations of human rights “that had occurred not earlier than 23 April 2005 or arising from facts which occurred prior to this date where these facts give rise to a continuing violation of human rights”. It follows that events that took place before 23 April 2005 generally fall outside the jurisdiction *ratione temporis* of the Panel. However, to the extent that such events gave rise to a continuing situation, the Panel has jurisdiction to examine complaints relating to that situation (see European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), Grand Chamber [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, nos. 16064/90 and others, judgment of 18 September 2009, §§ 147-149; ECtHR, *Cyprus v. Turkey* [GC] no. 25781/94, judgment of 10 May 2001, § 136, ECHR 2001-IV).

B. Alleged violation of the procedural obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR

52. The Panel considers that the complainants invoke a violation of the procedural obligation stemming from the right to life, guaranteed by Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) in that UNMIK Police did not conduct an effective investigation into abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović.

a. The Parties' submissions

53. The complainants in substance allege violations concerning the lack of an adequate criminal investigation into the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović. The complainants also state that they were not informed as to whether an investigation was conducted and what the outcome was.
54. The SRSG argues in his submission dated 18 April 2011 that since the abduction had been initially reported to KFOR, UNMIK was not aware of it until the mortal remains of both victims were located and subsequently identified. The SRSG states that attempts had been made to obtain further details from KFOR regarding the extent of any investigation but that no information had been forthcoming. As a result, the SRSG concludes that “UNMIK police cannot be held responsible for the lack of a proper investigation”.
55. The SRSG also argues that the “forensic investigation” into the case should be separated from the criminal and judicial elements. With respect to the forensic component, the SRSG's maintains that a full investigation was conducted by UNMIK Police, which led to the location and identification of the mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović. As such, he argues that there was no violation of this component of Article 2 of the ECHR which can be attributed to UNMIK.

56. Finally, with respect to the criminal investigation, he concludes that UNMIK cannot be held responsible for the lack of a proper criminal investigation due to the absence of any investigative documentation.
57. On 20 March 2013, UNMIK confirmed that the disclosure of information on the case could be considered final.

2. The Panel's Assessment

a) Submission of relevant files

58. As noted above (see § 33 above), UNMIK was not able to provide to the Panel any files related to the criminal investigation following the identification of the mortal remains into the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović.
59. The Panel notes that Section 15 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 states that the Panel may request the submission from UNMIK of any documents and that the SRSG shall cooperate with the Panel and provide the necessary assistance including, in particular, in the release of documents and information relevant to the complaint. The Panel in this regard refers to the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights that inferences shall be drawn from the conduct of the respondent party during the proceedings, including from its failure “to submit information in their hands without a satisfactory explanation” (see ECtHR, *Çelikbilek v. Turkey*, no. 27693/95, judgment of 31 May 2005, § 56). However, UNMIK did not provide to the Panel any investigative documents appertaining to the investigation into the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović after locating their mortal remains.
60. The Panel also notes that the proper maintenance of investigative files concerning crimes such as killings and disappearances, from the opening of investigations to their handing over, is crucial to the continuation of such investigations and failure to do so could thus raise *per se* issues under Article 2. The Panel likewise notes that UNMIK has not provided any explanation for the lack of any investigative documentation following the return of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović's mortal remains.
61. The Panel has no reason to doubt that UNMIK undertook all efforts in order to obtain the relevant investigative documentation. However, despite ample time given to UNMIK for that purpose (25 months), neither files, nor a plausible explanation of the reasons for their complete absence, were presented to the Panel. Therefore, the Panel has no other course of action but to proceed with an examination of the merits of this complaint only on the basis of documents made available by the complainants and the information provided by UNMIK with regard to the location and identification of the mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović, and to draw inferences from this situation (in this sense, see ECtHR, *Tsechoyev v. Russia*, no. 39358/05, judgment of 15 March 2011, § 146).

b) *General principles concerning the obligation to conduct an effective investigation under Article 2*

62. First, the Panel considers that the lack of any investigative files relating to those who may have been responsible for the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović raises issues of the burden of proof. In this regard, the Panel refers to the approach of the European Court on Human Rights as well as of the United Nations Human Rights Committee (HRC) on the matter. The general rule is that it is for the party who asserts a proposition of fact to prove it, but that this is not a rigid rule.
63. Following this general rule, at the admissibility stage an applicant must present facts, which are supportive of the allegations of the State's responsibility, that is, to establish a *prima facie* case against the authorities (see, *mutatis mutandis*, ECtHR, *Artico v. Italy*, no. 6694/74, judgment of 13 May 1980, §§ 29-30, Series A no. 37; ECtHR, *Toğcu v. Turkey*, no. 27601/95, judgment of 31 May 2005, § 95). However, the European Court further holds that "... where the events in issue lie wholly, or in large part, within the exclusive knowledge of the authorities ... The burden of proof may then be regarded as resting on the authorities to provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation" (see ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v Turkey*, cited above in § 51, at §§ 183-184).
64. The European Court also states that "... it is for the Government either to argue conclusively why the documents in question cannot serve to corroborate the allegations made by the applicants, or to provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation of how the events in question occurred, failing which an issue under Article 2 and/or Article 3 of the Convention will arise" (see ECtHR, *Akkum and Others v. Turkey*, no. 21894/93, judgment of 24 June 2005, § 211, ECHR 2005-II (extracts)). The Court adds that "... [i]f they [the authorities] then fail to disclose crucial documents to enable the Court to establish the facts or otherwise provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation, strong inferences may be drawn" (see ECtHR, *Varnava and Others v Turkey* [GC], cited § 51 above, at § 184; see also, HRC, *Benaniza v Algeria*, Views of 26 July 2010, § 9.4, CCPR/C/99/D/1588/2007; HRC, *Bashasha v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*, Views of 20 October 2010, § 7.2, CCPR/C/100/D/1776/2008).
65. The Panel understands that the international jurisprudence has developed in a context where the Government in question may be involved in the substantive allegations, which is not the case with UNMIK. The Panel nevertheless considers that since the documentation was under the exclusive control of UNMIK authorities, at least until the handover to EULEX, the principle that "strong inferences" may be drawn from lack of documentation is applicable.
66. Second, the Panel notes that the positive obligation to investigate disappearances is widely accepted in international human rights law since at least the case of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACtHR) *Velásquez-Rodríguez* (see IACtHR, *Velásquez-Rodríguez v. Honduras*, judgment of 29 July 1988, Series C No. 4). The positive obligation has also been stated by the HRC as stemming from Article 6 (right to life), Article 7 (prohibition of cruel and inhuman treatment) and Article 9 (right to liberty and security of person), read in conjunction with Article 2(3) (right to an effective remedy) of the ICCPR (see HRC, General Comment No. 6, 30 April 1982, § 4; HRC, General Comment

No. 31, 26 May 2004, §§ 8 and 18, CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add. 13; see also, among others, HRC, *Mohamed El Awani, v. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya*, communication no. 1295/2004, views of 11 July 2007, CCPR/C/90/D/1295/2004). The obligation to investigate disappearances and killings is also asserted in the UN Declaration on the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearances (A/Res/47/133, 18 December 1992), and further detailed in UN guidelines such as the UN Manual on the Effective Prevention and Investigation of Extra-Legal Arbitrary and Summary Executions (1991) and the “Guidelines for the Conduct of United Nations Inquiries into Allegations of Massacres” (1995). The importance of the obligation is confirmed by the adoption of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance in 2006, which entered into force on 23 December 2010.

67. In order to address the complainant’s allegations, the Panel refers, in particular, to the well-established case law of the European Court on Human Rights on the procedural obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR. The Court has held that “[The] obligation to protect the right to life under Article 2 of the Convention, read in conjunction with the State’s general duty under Article 1 of the Convention to “secure to everyone within [its] jurisdiction the rights and freedoms defined in [the] Convention”, requires by implication that there should be some form of effective official investigation when individuals have been killed (see, *mutatis mutandis*, ECtHR, *McCann and Others v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 27 September 1995, § 161, Series A no. 324; and ECtHR, *Kaya v. Turkey*, judgment of 19 February 1998, § 105, Reports 1998-I; see also ECtHR, *Jasinskis v. Latvia*, no. 45744/08, judgment of 21 December 2010, § 71). The duty to conduct such an investigation arises in all cases of killing and other suspicious death, whether the perpetrators were private persons or State agents or are unknown (see ECtHR, *Kolevi v. Bulgaria*, no. 1108/02, judgment of 5 November 2009, § 191).
68. The European Court has also stated that the procedural obligation to provide some form of effective official investigation exists also when an individual has gone missing in life-threatening circumstances and is not confined to cases where it is apparent that the disappearance was caused by an agent of the State (see ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 51 above, at § 136).
69. The authorities must act of their own motion once the matter has come to their attention, and they cannot leave it to the initiative of the next-of-kin either to lodge a formal complaint or to take responsibility for the conduct of any investigative procedure (see ECtHR, *Ahmet Özkan and Others v. Turkey*, no. 21689/93, judgment of 6 April 2004, § 310; see also ECtHR, *Isayeva v. Russia*, no. 57950/00, judgment of 24 February 2005, § 210).
70. Setting out the standards of an effective investigation, the Court has stated that “beside being independent, accessible to the victim’s family, carried out with reasonable promptness and expedition, affording a sufficient element of public scrutiny of the investigation and its results, the investigation must also be effective in the sense that is capable of leading to a determination of whether the death was caused unlawfully and if so, to the identification and punishment of those responsible (see ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 51 above, at § 191; see also ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, no. 4704/04, judgment of 15 February 2011, § 63). This is not an obligation of results but of means. The authorities must take whatever reasonable steps they can to

secure the evidence concerning the incident, including, inter alia eye-witness testimony, forensic evidence and, where appropriate, an autopsy which provides a complete and accurate record of injury and an objective analysis of the clinical findings, including the cause of death. Any deficiency in the investigation which undermines its ability to establish the cause of death or the person or persons responsible will risk falling foul of this standard (see ECtHR, *AhmetÖzkan and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 69 above, at § 312; and *Isayeva v. Russia*, cited in § 69 above, at § 212).

71. In particular, the investigation's conclusion must be based on thorough, objective and impartial analysis of all relevant elements. Failing to follow an obvious line of enquiry undermines to a decisive extent the investigation's ability to establish the circumstances of the case and the identity of those responsible (see ECtHR, *Kolevi v. Bulgaria*, cited in § 67 above, at § 201). Nevertheless, the nature and degree of scrutiny which satisfy the minimum threshold of the investigation's effectiveness depend on the circumstances of the particular case. They must be assessed on the basis of all relevant facts and with regard to the practical realities of the investigation work (see ECtHR, *Velcea and Mazărev. Romania*, no. 64301/01, judgment of 1 December 2009, § 105).
72. Specifically with regard to persons disappeared and later found dead, the Court has stated that the procedures of exhuming and identifying mortal remains do not exhaust the obligation under Article 2 of the ECHR. The Court holds that "the procedural obligation arising from a disappearance will generally remain as long as the whereabouts and fate of the person are unaccounted for, and it is thus of a continuing nature" (ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited in § 70 above, at § 46; in the same sense ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 51 above, at § 148, *Aslakhanova and Others v. Russia*, nos. 2944/06 and others, judgment of 18 December 2012, § 122). However, the Court also stresses that this procedural obligation "does not come to an end even on discovery of the body This only casts light on one aspect of the fate of the missing person and the obligation to account for the disappearance and death, as well as to identify and prosecute any perpetrator of unlawful acts in that connection, will generally remain" (ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited above, at § 46; in the same sense ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 51 above, at § 145). While the location and the subsequent identification of the mortal remains of the victim may in themselves be significant achievements, the procedural obligation under Article 2 continues to exist (see ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited above, at § 70 above).
73. On the requirement of public scrutiny, the Court has further stated that there must be a sufficient element of public scrutiny of the investigation or its results to secure accountability in practice as well as in theory. The degree of public scrutiny required may well vary from case to case. In all cases, however, the victim's next-of-kin must be involved in the procedure to the extent necessary to safeguard his or her legitimate interests (see ECtHR, *AhmetÖzkan and Others*, cited in § 69 above, at §§ 311-314; ECtHR, *Isayeva v. Russia*, cited in § 69 above, at §§ 211-214 and the cases cited therein; ECtHR [GC], *Al-Skeini and Others v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 7 July 2011, no. 55721/07, § 167, ECHR 2011).

c) *Applicability of Article 2 to the Kosovo context*

74. The Panel is conscious that the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović occurred during the deployment of UNMIK in Kosovo in the immediate aftermath of the armed conflict, when crime, violence and insecurity were rife.
75. The Panel must consider whether the standards of Article 2 continue to apply in a situation of conflict or generalised violence and, whether such standards shall be considered fully applicable to UNMIK, in particular during the first phase of its mission.
76. As regards the applicability of Article 2 to UNMIK, the Panel recalls that with the adoption of the UNMIK Regulation No. 1999/1 on 25 July 1999 UNMIK undertook an obligation to observe internationally recognised human rights standards in exercising its functions. This undertaking was detailed in UNMIK Regulation No. 1999/24 of 12 December 1999, by which UNMIK assumed obligations under certain international human rights instruments, including the ECHR. In this respect, the Panel has already found that it is true that UNMIK's interim character and related difficulties must be duly taken into account with regard to a number of situations, but under no circumstances could these elements be taken as a justification for diminishing standards of respect for human rights, which were duly incorporated into UNMIK's mandate (see HRAP, *Milogorić and Others*, nos. 38/08 and others, opinion of 24 March 2011, § 44; *Berisha and Others*, nos. 27/08 and others, opinion of 23 February 2011, § 25; *Lalić and Others*, nos. 09/08 and others, opinion of 9 June 2012, § 22).
77. Concerning the applicability of Article 2 to situations of conflict or generalised violence, the Panel recalls that the European Court on Human Rights has established the applicability of Article 2 to post-conflict situations, including in countries of the former Yugoslavia (see, among other examples, ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited in § 70 above, and ECtHR, *Jularić v. Croatia*, no. 20106/06, judgment of 20 January 2011). The Court has further held that that the procedural obligation under Article 2 continues to apply in "difficult security conditions, including in a context of armed conflict" (see ECtHR [GC], *Al-Skeini and Others v. the United Kingdom*, cited in § 73 above, at § 164; see also ECtHR, *Güleç v. Turkey*, judgment of 27 July 1998, § 81, Reports 1998-IV; ECtHR, *Ergi v. Turkey*, judgment of 28 July 1998, §§ 79 and 82, Reports 1998-IV; ECtHR, *Ahmet Özkan and Others v. Turkey*, cited in § 69 above, at §§ 85-90, 309-320 and 326-330; *Isayeva v. Russia*, cited in § 69 above, at §§ 180 and 210; ECtHR, *Kanlibaş v. Turkey*, no. 32444/96, judgment of 8 December 2005, §§ 39-51).
78. The Court has acknowledged that "where the death [and disappearances] to be investigated under Article 2 occur in circumstances of generalised violence, armed conflict or insurgency, obstacles may be placed in the way of investigators and concrete constraints may compel the use of less effective measures of investigation or may cause an investigation to be delayed" (see, ECtHR [GC], *Al-Skeini and Others v. the United Kingdom*, cited § 73 above, at § 164; ECtHR, *Bazorkina v. Russia*, no. 69481/01, judgment of 27 July 2006, § 121). Nonetheless, the Court has held that "the obligation under Article 2 to safeguard life entails that, even in difficult security conditions, all reasonable steps must be taken to ensure that an effective, independent investigation is conducted into alleged breaches of the right to life (see, amongst many other examples, ECtHR, *Kaya v. Turkey*, cited in § 67 above, at §§ 86-92; ECtHR, *Ergi v Turkey*, cited above, at §§ 82-85; ECtHR

[GC], *Tanrikulu v. Turkey*, no. 23763/94, judgment of 8 July 1999, §§ 101-110, ECHR 1999-IV; ECtHR, *Khashiyev and Akayeva v. Russia*, nos. 57942/00 and 57945/00, judgment of 24 February 2005, §§ 156-166; ECtHR, *Isayeva v. Russia*, cited in § 69 above, at §§ 215-224; ECtHR, *Musayev and Others v. Russia*, nos. 57941/00 and others, judgment of 26 July 2007, §§ 158-165).

79. Similarly, the HRC has held that the right to life, including its procedural guarantees, shall be considered as the supreme right from which no derogation is permitted even in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation (see, HRC, General Comment No. 6, cited in § 66 above, at § 1; HRC, *AbubakarAmirov and AizanAmirova v. Russian Federation*, communication no. 1447/2006, views of 22 April 2009, § 11.2, CCPR/C/95/D/1447/2006). Further, the HRC has stated the applicability of Article 2 (3), 6 and 7 of the ICCPR with specific reference to UNMIK's obligation to conduct proper investigations on disappearances and abductions in Kosovo (see HRC, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee: Kosovo (Serbia), 14 August 2006, §§ 12-13, CCPR/C/UNK/CO/1).
80. The Panel appreciates the difficulties encountered by UNMIK during the first phase of its deployment. The Panel notes that the appropriate importance attached to the issue of missing persons in Kosovo meant that UNMIK had to take into account both the humanitarian and criminal dimensions of the situation. In particular, the Panel considers that the importance attached to the criminal investigations and the difficulties in Kosovo that limited the abilities of investigating authorities to conduct such investigations, as described by the SRSG, made it crucial that UNMIK establish from the outset an environment conducive to the performance of meaningful investigations. This would involve putting in place a system that would include such elements as the allocation of overall responsibility for the supervision and monitoring of progress in investigations, provision for the regular review of the status of investigations, and a process for the proper handover of cases between different officers or units of UNMIK Police. Such a system should also take account of the protection needs of victims and witnesses (see, *mutatis mutandis*, ECtHR, *R.R. and Others v. Hungary*, no. 19400/11, judgment of 4 December 2012, §§ 28-32), as well as to consider the special vulnerability of displaced persons in post-conflict situations (see ECtHR [GC], *Sargsyan v. Azerbaijan*, no. 40167/06, decision of 14 December 2011, § 145; and ECtHR [GC], *Chiragov and Others v. Armenia*, no. 13216/05, decision of 14 December 2011, § 146). While understanding that the deployment and the organisation of the police and justice apparatus occurred gradually, the Panel deems that this process was completed in 2003 when the police and justice system in Kosovo was described as being “well-functioning” and “sustainable” by the UN Secretary-General (see § 18 above).
81. The Panel further notes that its task is not to review relevant practices or alleged obstacles to the conduct of effective investigations *in abstracto*, but only in relation to their specific application to the particular circumstances of a situation subject of a complaint before it (see, ECtHR, *Brogan and Others v. the United Kingdom*, judgment of 29 November 1988, § 53, Series A no. 145-B). The Panel therefore concludes that the nature and degree of scrutiny to determine whether the effectiveness of the investigation satisfies the minimum threshold depends on the circumstances of the particular case. For these reasons, the Panel considers that it will establish with regard to each case if all

reasonable steps were taken to conduct an effective investigation as prescribed by Article 2, having regard to the realities of the investigative work in Kosovo.

d) Compliance with the requirements of Article 2 in the present case

82. Turning to the circumstances of the present case, the Panel first addresses the issue of the burden of proof. At the admissibility stage, the Panel was satisfied that the complainant's allegations were not groundless, thus it accepted the existence of a *prima facie* case: that Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović were abducted in life threatening circumstances and that, at the latest by the end of 2001, UNMIK became aware of the matter, at least as it pertains to Jovica Đukanović (see §§ 29 and 35 above). Therefore the Panel determines that, contrary to the SRSG's observations (see § 54 above), sufficient information existed by the end of 2001 for the commencement of an investigation into the abduction of and Jovica Đukanović and subsequently of Dragomir Đukanović as the two were related.
83. Accordingly, applying the principles discussed above (see §§ 62-73 above), the Panel considers that the burden of proof has shifted to the respondent, so that it is for UNMIK to present the Panel with evidence of an adequate investigation as a defence against the allegations put forward by the complainants and accepted by the Panel as admissible. UNMIK has not discharged its obligation in this regard, as it has neither presented any investigative file, nor has it in a "satisfactory and convincing" way explained its failure to do so. Accordingly, the Panel will draw inferences from this situation.
84. The Panel notes that according to the 2000 Annual Report of UNMIK Police, at least from mid-September 1999 the whole system of criminal investigation in Prishtinë/Priština region was under the full control of UNMIK. Therefore, it was UNMIK's responsibility to ensure, *first*, that the investigation is conducted expeditiously and efficiently; *second*, that all relevant investigative material is properly handed over to the authority taking over responsibility for investigation (see § 20 above); and *third*, that the investigative files could be traced and retrieved, should a need arise at any later stage.
85. The Panel infers from the absence of any investigative file dealing with events subsequent to the finding of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović's mortal remains, that one of the following situations occurred: no investigation was carried out; UNMIK deliberately opted not to present the file to the Panel, despite its obligation to cooperate with the Panel and to provide it with the necessary assistance, including the release of documents relevant to the complaints under Section 15 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 (cited in § 49 above); the file was not properly handed over to EULEX; or UNMIK failed to retrieve the file from the current custodian.
86. The Panel has already noted above that it has no reason to doubt UNMIK's good faith in seeking to provide the investigative file for the Panel's review. However, the Panel considers that whichever of these potential explanations is applicable, it indicates a failure, which is directly attributable to UNMIK, either when it was exercising its executive functions, or in its current capacity.
87. Examining the particulars of this case, the Panel notes that there were obvious shortcomings in the conduct of the investigation from its inception, having in mind that that the initial

stage of the investigation is of the utmost importance. However, in light of the considerations developed above concerning its limited temporal jurisdiction (see § 51 above), the Panel recalls that it is competent *ratione temporis* to evaluate the compliance of the investigation with Article 2 of the ECHR only for the period after 23 April 2005, while taking into consideration the state of the case at that date (ECtHR, *Palić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*, cited in § 70 above, at § 70). The period under review ends on 9 December 2008, with EULEX taking over responsibility in the area of administration of justice (see § 20 above).

88. The Panel notes that from the moment UNMIK became aware of the matter until 23 April 2005, the only actions undertaken by UNMIK relate to the exhumation, identification and handing over of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović's mortal remains, which was carried out on 2 August 2005. Although this must be considered in itself an important achievement, the Panel recalls that the procedural obligation under Article 2 did not come to an end with the discovery of the victims' mortal remains, especially considering the circumstances of their abduction. Nonetheless, there is no evidence that any action was undertaken with respect to clarifying the circumstances surrounding the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović. As a result, UNMIK's obligation to investigate this case did not cease with the location and identification of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović's mortal remains (see § 61 above). The Panel concludes, therefore, that the SRSG's observation that UNMIK did not violate Article 2 of ECHR due to it establishing the location of these bodies, does not in itself discharge its obligation in this regard.
89. In particular, there is no indication that UNMIK Police undertook in this respect any investigative steps such as: interviewing the complainants and other family members aside from a sister, interviewing potential witnesses, identifying the ownership of the vehicle used to take the victims, or locating and interviewing those named persons suspected of having been involved in the abduction.
90. Coming to the period within its jurisdiction, starting from 23 April 2005, the Panel notes that there is no evidence that any basic investigative steps as indicated (see above) had been carried out. After that critical date the failure to conduct the necessary investigative actions persisted, thus, in accordance with the continuing obligation to investigate (see § 72 above), bringing the assessment of the whole investigation within the period of the Panel's jurisdiction.
91. In addition, the Panel considers that, as those responsible for the crime had not been located, UNMIK was obligated to use the means at its disposal to regularly review the case. The aim being to ensure that nothing had been overlooked and any new evidence had been considered, as well as to inform the relatives of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović regarding any possible new leads of enquiry. However, there is no indication that any such review was ever undertaken.
92. The apparent lack of any adequate reaction from UNMIK Police may have suggested to perpetrators that the authorities were either not able, or not willing to investigate such criminal acts. Such an attitude of the authorities towards the gravest crimes in any society, and especially in post-conflict circumstances, inevitably creates a culture of impunity

among the criminals and can only lead to a worsening of the situation. The problems which UNMIK had encountered at the beginning of its mission, which were discussed above, do not justify such inaction, either at the outset or subsequently.

93. The Panel therefore considers that, having regard to all the circumstances of the particular case, no steps appear to have been taken by UNMIK to clarify the circumstances of the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović and bring any perpetrators to justice. In this sense the Panel considers that the investigation was not adequate and did not comply with the requirements of promptness, expedition and effectiveness (see § 70 above), as required by Article 2.
94. As concerns the requirement of public scrutiny, the Panel recalls that Article 2 also requires the victim's next-of-kin to be involved in the investigation to the extent necessary to safeguard his or her legitimate interests. In this regard, the complainants claim that they were never informed about the steps taken by the investigators. The Panel notes that the complainants only communication with UNMIK was made through a relative and related to the recovery, handover and burial of the mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović; the last communication in this respect took place in August 2005. As the Panel has already noted (see § 89 above), no statement was ever taken from the complainants and no information was given to them concerning the status of the investigation.
95. The Panel understands the complainants' view that the extent of the information received was unsatisfactory. The Panel is also aware that in all cases, the victim's next-of-kin must be involved in the procedure to the extent necessary to safeguard his or her legitimate interest (see ECtHR [GC], *Tahsin Acar v Turkey*, no. 26307/95, judgment of 8 April 2004, § 226, ECHR 2004-III; ECtHR, *Taniş v Turkey*, no. 65899/01, judgment of 2 August 2005, § 204, ECHR 2005-VIII). The Panel therefore considers that the investigation was not accessible to the complainants as required by Article 2.
96. In light of the deficiencies and shortcomings as described above, the Panel concludes that UNMIK failed to carry out an adequate and effective investigation into the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović. There has been accordingly a violation of Article 2 of the ECHR under its procedural limb.

C. Alleged violation of Article 3 of the ECHR

97. The Panel considers that the complainants invoke, in substance, a violation of the right to be free from inhumane or degrading treatment, guaranteed by Article 3 of the ECHR.
98. The SRSG does not make further submissions with specific reference to the alleged violation of Article 3 of the ECHR.
99. In its decision of 18 March 2011, the Panel declared the complaint under Article 3 admissible. Nevertheless, the Panel has to reassess the admissibility of this part of the complaint, in light of subsequent developments in the Panel's case law concerning the admissibility of complaints under Article 3 of the ECHR.

100. In particular, the Panel notes that according to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights a member of the family of a disappeared person can under certain conditions be considered the victim of treatment by the authorities contrary to Article 3 of the ECHR, which prohibits inhuman treatment. Where the disappeared person is later found dead, the applicability of Article 3 is in principle limited to the distinct period during which the member of the family sustained the uncertainty, anguish and distress appertaining to the specific phenomenon of disappearances (see, *e.g.*, ECtHR, *Luluyev and Others v. Russia*, no. 69480/01, judgment of 9 November 2006, §§ 114-115, ECHR 2006-XIII (extracts); ECtHR, *Gongadze v. Ukraine*, no. 34056/02, judgment of 8 November 2005, § 185, ECHR 2005-XI).
101. In particular, the Panel refers to the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and to its own case-law with respect to the question whether a member of the family of a disappeared person can be considered the victim of a treatment contrary to Article 3 of the ECHR. The European Court accepts that this may be the case, depending on the existence of “special factors which give the suffering of the [family member] a dimension and character distinct from the emotional distress which may be regarded as inevitably caused to relatives of a victim of a serious human rights violation”. The Court further holds that “relevant elements will include the proximity of the family tie, the particular circumstances of the relationship, the extent to which the family member witnessed the events in question, the involvement of the family member in the attempts to obtain information about the disappeared person and the way in which the authorities responded to those enquiries”. It also emphasizes “that the essence of such a violation does not so much lie in the fact of the disappearance of the family member but rather concerns the authorities’ reactions and attitudes to the situation when it is brought to their attention” (see, *e.g.*, ECtHR [GC], *Çakici v. Turkey*, no. 23657/94, judgment of 8 July 1999, § 98, ECHR, 1999-IV; ECtHR [GC], *Cyprus v. Turkey*, no. 25781/94, judgment of 10 May 2001, § 156, ECHR, 2001-IV; ECtHR, *Orhan v. Turkey*, no. 25656/94, judgment of 18 June 2002, § 358; ECtHR, *Bazorkina v. Russia*, no. 69481/01, cited in § 78 above, at § 139; see also HRAP, *Radovanović*, decision of 16 September 2011, § 41).
102. The Panel has held that a complainant may invoke a violation of Article 3 of the ECHR even if there is no explicit reference to specific acts of the authorities involved in the investigation, since also the passivity of the authorities and the absence of information given to the complainant may be indicative of inhuman treatment of the complainant by the authorities (see HRAP, *Mladenović*, no. 99/09, decision of 11 August 2011, § 22).
103. However, the Panel recalls the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights stating that, where the disappeared person is later found dead, the applicability of Article 3 of the ECHR is in general limited to the distinct period during which the member of the family sustained uncertainty, anguish and distress appertaining to the specific phenomenon of disappearances (see, *e.g.*, ECtHR, *Luluyev and Others v. Russia*, no. 69480/01, judgment of 9 November 2006, §§ 114-115, ECHR, 2006-XIII; see also ECtHR, *Gongadze v. Ukraine*, no. 34056/02, judgment of 8 November 2005, § 185, ECHR, 2005-XI).
104. In this respect, the question arises whether the complaint has been filed in time. Section 3.1 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 states that the Panel “may only deal with a matter ... within a period of six months from the date on which the final decision was taken”. As

a rule, the six-month period runs from the date of the final decision in the process of exhaustion of domestic remedies. Where it is clear from the outset however that no effective remedy is available to the complainant, the period runs from the date of the acts or measures complained of, or from the date of knowledge of that act or its effect on or prejudice to the complainant (ECtHR [GC], *Varnava and Others v. Turkey*, cited in 70 above, at § 157). Where the complaint relates to a continuing situation, which has come to an end, the six-month time limit starts to run from the date on which the situation has come to an end.

105. The Panel notes that the mortal remains of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović were returned to the complainants on 2 August 2005. It is at that moment that the period during which an issue could arise under Article 3 of the ECHR, came to an end. For the purpose of Section 3.1 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12, the six-month time limit therefore started to run from that date.
106. The complaint lodged by Mrs Rada Đukanović (case no. 67/09) was filed with the Panel on 30 April 2009 whilst the complaint of Mrs Radmila Đukanović (case no. 140/09) was filed on 30 April 2009, both dates being after the expiration of the above-referred six-month period.
107. The Panel therefore must conclude that this part of the complaint falls outside the time-limit set by Section 3.1 of UNMIK Regulation No. 2006/12 and thus will not be examined in its merits (HRAP, *Radovanović*, cited in § 101 above, at §§ 20-23).

V. CONCLUDING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

108. In light of the Panel's findings in this case, the Panel is of the opinion that some form of reparation is necessary.
109. The Panel notes that enforced disappearances and arbitrary killings constitute serious violations of human rights which the competent authorities are under an obligation to investigate and to bring perpetrators to justice under all circumstances. The Panel also notes that pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999) UNMIK from 1999 to 2008 had the primary responsibility to effectively investigate and prosecute the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović, and that its failure to do so constitutes a further serious violation of the human rights of the victim and his next-of-kin, in particular the right to have the truth of the matter determined.
110. The Panel notes that UNMIK's inadequate resources, especially at the outset of its mission, made compliance with UNMIK's human rights obligations difficult to achieve.
111. It would normally be for UNMIK to take the appropriate measures in order to put an end to the violation noted and to redress as far as possible the effects thereof. However, as the Panel noted above (see § 20) UNMIK's responsibility with regard to the administration of justice in Kosovo ended on 9 December 2008, with EULEX assuming full operational control in the area of rule of law. UNMIK therefore is no longer in a position to take measures that will have a direct impact on the investigations that are still pending before

EULEX or local authorities. Likewise, following the declaration of independence by the Kosovo Provisional Institutions of Self-Government on 17 February 2008 and subsequently, the entry into force of the Kosovo Constitution on 15 June 2008, UNMIK ceased to perform executive functions in Kosovo, this fact limiting its ability to provide full and effective reparation of the violation committed, as required by established principles of international human rights law.

112. The Panel considers that this factual situation does not relieve UNMIK from its obligation to redress as far as possible the effects of the violations for which it is responsible.

With respect to the complainants and the case the Panel considers it appropriate that UNMIK:

- In line with the case law of the European Court of Human Rights on situations of limited State jurisdiction (see ECtHR [GC], *Ilaşcu and Others v. Moldova and Russia*, no. 48787/99, judgment of 8 July 2004, § 333, ECHR 2004-VII; ECtHR, *Al-Saadoon and Mufdhi v. the United Kingdom*, no. 61498/08, judgment of 2 March 2010, § 171, ECHR 2010 (extracts); ECtHR [GC], *Catan and Others v. Republic of Moldova and Russia* [GC], nos. 43370/04 and others, judgment of 19 October 2012, § 109), must endeavour, with all the diplomatic means available to it *vis-à-vis* EULEX and the Kosovo authorities, to obtain assurances that the investigations concerning the case at issue will be continued in compliance with the requirements of an effective investigation as envisaged by Article 2, that the circumstances surrounding the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović will be established and that perpetrators will be brought to justice; the complainants and/or other next-of-kin shall be informed of such proceedings and relevant documents shall be disclosed to them, as necessary;
- Publicly acknowledges, within a reasonable time, responsibility with respect to UNMIK's failure to adequately investigate the abduction and death of Dragomir Đukanović and Jovica Đukanović and makes a public apology to the complainants and their family in this regard;
- Takes appropriate steps towards payment of adequate compensation of the complainants for the moral damage suffered due to UNMIK's failure to conduct an effective investigation as stated above.

The Panel also considers it appropriate that UNMIK:

- In line with the UN General Assembly Resolution on “Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law” (A/Res/60/147, 21 March 2006), takes appropriate steps, through other UN affiliated entities operating in Kosovo, local bodies and non-governmental organisations, for the realisation of a full and comprehensive reparation programme, including restitution compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction and guarantees of non-repetition, for the victims from all communities of serious violations of human rights which occurred during and in the aftermath of the Kosovo conflict;

- Takes appropriate steps before competent bodies of the United Nations, including the UN Secretary-General, towards the allocation of adequate human and financial resources to ensure that international human rights standards are upheld at all times by the United Nations, including when performing administrative and executive functions over a territory, and to make provision for effective and independent monitoring.

FOR THESE REASONS,

The Panel, unanimously,

- 1. FINDS THAT THERE HAS BEEN A VIOLATION OF THE PROCEDURAL OBLIGATION UNDER ARTICLE 2 OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS;**
- 2. DECLARES THE COMPLAINT UNDER ARTICLE 3 OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS INADMISSIBLE DUE TO THE SIX-MONTH RULE.**
- 3. RECOMMENDS THAT UNMIK:**
 - a. URGES EULEX AND OTHER COMPETENT AUTHORITIES IN KOSOVO TO TAKE ALL POSSIBLE STEPS IN ORDER TO ENSURE THAT THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE ABDUCTION AND DEATH OF DRAGOMIR ĐUKANOVIĆ AND JOVICA ĐUKANOVIĆ IS CONTINUED IN COMPLIANCE WITH ARTICLE 2 OF THE ECHR AND THAT THE PERPETRATORS ARE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE;**
 - b. PUBLICLY ACKNOWLEDGES RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS FAILURE TO CONDUCT AN EFFECTIVE INVESTIGATION INTO THE ABDUCTION AND DEATH OF DRAGOMIR ĐUKANOVIĆ AND JOVICA ĐUKANOVIĆ AND MAKES A PUBLIC APOLOGY TO THE COMPLAINANTS;**
 - c. TAKES APPROPRIATE STEPS TOWARDS PAYMENT OF ADEQUATE COMPENSATION TO THE COMPLAINANTS FOR MORAL DAMAGE;**
 - d. TAKES APPROPRIATE STEPS TOWARDS THE REALISATION OF A FULL AND COMPREHENSIVE REPARATION PROGRAMME;**
 - e. TAKES APPROPRIATE STEPS AT THE UNITED NATIONS AS A GUARANTEE OF NON-REPETITION;**
 - f. TAKES IMMEDIATE AND EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL AND TO INFORM THE**

**COMPLAINANTS AND THE PANEL ABOUT FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS
IN THIS CASE.**

Andrey ANTONOV
Executive Officer

Marek NOWICKI
Presiding Member

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CCIU- Central Criminal Investigation Unit
DOJ - Department of Justice
ECHR - European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR- European Court of Human Rights
EU - European Union
EULEX - European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo
FRY - Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
GC - Grand Chamber of the European Court of Human Rights
HRAP - Human Rights Advisory Panel
HRC - United Nations Human Rights Committee
IACtHR- Inter-American Court of Human Rights
ICCPR - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICMP - International Commission of Missing Persons
ICRC - International Committee of the Red Cross
KFOR - International Security Force (commonly known as Kosovo Force)
KLA - Kosovo Liberation Army
MoU - Memorandum of Understanding
MPU - Missing Persons Unit
NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OMPF - Office on Missing Persons and Forensics
OSCE - Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe
SRSG - Special Representative of the Secretary-General
UN - United Nations
UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNMIK - United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo
VRIC - Victim Recovery and Identification Commission
WCIU - War Crimes Investigation Unit